DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 721 IR 003 193

AUTHOR Nascimento, Vitoria
TITLE FSU Latin American Alumni Meeting Summary Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Florida State Univ., Tallahassee. Center for Educational Technology.
SPONS AGENCY Agency for International Development (Dept. of State), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 75
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Conference Reports; Curriculum Evaluation; *Educational Programs; *Educational Technology; *Higher Education; Interagency Cooperation; International Education; *International Programs; Media Specialists; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Education; Teaching Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Florida State Univ Center Educational Technology; Latin America

ABSTRACT

To assess the effectiveness of a training program designed to prepare educational technologists for work in Latin America, the Center for Educational Technology at Florida State University (FSU) called a conference of alumni currently employed in Latin America. In addition to evaluating the Center's program, the conference provided for an exchange of information about Latin American educational technology programs, research results, and possible cooperative ventures in the fields of training, research, and technology. This conference report includes a list of the participants accompanied by a list of their associated programs, a conference agenda, and details of the FSU program evaluation. (EMH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119721

CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY, TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

SUMMARY EVALUATION REPORT

BY

VITORIA NASCIMENTO

APRIL, 1975

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Conference whose evaluation is reported herein was sponsored by the Agency for International Development (Grant No. AID/ta-G-1161).

IR 003 193

FOREWARD

Essential to any effort in changing and improving educational practices are people. The foundation stone to Florida State University's commitment to educational improvement in developing countries is the training and development of people from those countries. In the past six years representatives from nearly all the countries of Latin America have received either advanced degrees or special training at FSU's Center for Educational Technology. While these students have specialized in several different areas - instructional design, evaluation and measurement, educational management, non-formal education and others - all have shared common experiences in CET. These experiences have intended to develop competencies in the broad area of educational reform. In addition to the specialized professional tools the student develops, he is also imbued with a sense of personal responsibility to do what he can to upgrade and improve the educational practices of his country. He is exposed to economic and political aspects of the educational system and he explores different strategies for change which have been employed, both successfully and unsuccessfully elsewhere. He is taught the value of establishing interpersonal and institutional linkages. Finally, he is taught that educational change and improvement is a real possibility and that he as an individual can materially contribute to making changes occur.

Because of our hope that these alumni will become significant instruments for educational reform we tend to maintain a closer than normal contact with them after they leave the campus. This continuing association includes correspondence, sending the CET monthly newsletter, relevant articles and reports and receiving regularly information about the students' professional activities. CET staff members also call on former students as they travel throughout Latin America. From this dialogue we are kept informed on the work these people are engaged in and the kinds of problems they are encountering.

Since 1970 more than one hundred students from Latin America have studied at CET. These students have been sponsored by the Agency for International Development, the Organization of American States, their own countries, and by Florida State University. Upon returning to their countries, roughly two thirds of the students have been employed by national governments (Ministries of Education, Planning, etc.) or international development agencies (OAS, UNESCO, etc.). The remainder have tended to go to institutions of higher education as professors or administrators.

In keeping with our policy of continuing association with the CET graduates a week-long meeting was held in Lima with a representative sample of these Latin American alumni. The purposes and accomplishments of that meeting are described in the report which follows.

Robert M. Morgan
Tallahassee

CONTENTS

SECTION I: THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT 1

SECTION II: THE MEETING

The Meeting site, participants, and activities 2

The reports on projects and activities developed by participants 3

The presentation by special guest 7

The topics addressed through small group meetings and seminar discussions 7

SECTION III: THE EVALUATION

The evaluation design 10

The results 12

The conclusions and recommendations 20

Appendices APPENDIX I

List of participants 24

APPENDIX II

Evaluation schedule and instruments 28

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I:	Meeting objectives, indicators of accomplishment, and techniques for verification	11
TABLE II:	Participant ratings of the relevance of areas of competence in FSU training program and degree of their satisfaction with the training	12
TABLE III:	Activities initiated by former students grouped by types	15
TABLE IV	Problems related to the implementation of Educational Technology in terms of their degree of seriousness as perceived by participants	16
TABLE V:	Evaluation of meeting aspects as reported by participants	17

SECTION I: THE RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT

An important objective of the Center for Educational Technology (CET) is to provide training opportunities for both U.S. and foreign personnel. In the latter category representatives from Latin American countries have made up a large portion, a number of them in programs sponsored by the Agency for International Development (AID) and the Organization of American States (OAS).

The idea of the FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING grew out of the need felt by CET to evaluate the effectiveness of its training program as reflected in the perceptions of former recipients now working in the field of Educational Technology in Latin American countries. Furthermore, the meeting would not only serve FSU's purpose but also provide participants with an opportunity for sharing professional experience.

These two broad purposes of the meeting were broken down into the following specific objectives:

- to gather information to determine what activities have been initiated by the trainees and to isolate the problems, successes, and failures of such activities;

- to gather research and/or descriptive papers, and other written products from the meeting participants that could be disseminated to a wider audience;

- to explore the possibility of cooperative research, training, and development activities among Latin American countries and FSU;

- to explore the possibility of creating a technical pool among Latin American education specialists;

- to provide participants with an opportunity to share information as to the applicability of Educational Technology to Latin American educational problems; (1)

- to gather information that may function as feedback to FSU as to

---

(1) This objective differs from the one initially stated in the grant document and better reflects the idea of FSU personnel as to their expectations for the meeting.

the adequacy of its training program in Educational Technology as reflected back from the Conference participants. (2)

SECTION II: THE MEETING

Lima (Peru), the meeting site, was selected on the basis of the following criteria:

- central geographical position in relation to the countries represented in the meeting;

- adequacy of facilities available for both lodging and conference.

In addition, the Granja Azul Inn, a resort on the outskirts of Lima, was selected to provide an opportunity for a more relaxed environment and concentration on the meeting activities. To facilitate arrangements in the locale selected for the meeting, a subcontract was made with the Peruvian Institute for the Promotion of Education (IPFE) which was held responsible for support details such as airport-hotel transfers, lodgings, meals, and secretarial support.

Invitees for the meeting (list presented in Appendix I) can be grouped in three main categories:

- participants: within this category were included FSU former alumni and FSU personnel;

- participant-observers: including representatives from AID/W and OAS;

- observers: invitees not included in the previous categories.

Criteria for the selection of FSU former alumni to be invited were as follows:

---

(2) This statement was made explicit in the evaluation requirements specified in the grant document. However, as it addresses an issue of crucial importance to FSU and directly dealt with during the conference, it was added to the specific objectives originally stated.

- quality of work performance during FSU training program;

- nature and relevance of position occupied in the educational system;

- balance of representation of former trainees by countries in which they are presently working.

A proposed program of activities built upon suggestions offered by some of the former FSU alumni was sent to all invitees on March 20 and included a list of themes for discussion as well as general methodological guidelines. This program was meant to be tentative and subject to modifications to better respond to participants' interests as evidenced through the formative evaluation of the meeting.

Basically, there were three types of activities on the formal level of the meeting:

- plenary sessions, with presentation of individual or group projects;

- small group meetings, aiming at providing opportunity for interaction among participants about specific topics;

- seminar discussions in which reports from small groups were presented and discussed in the larger group.

Items that follow are intended to briefly relate and describe some of the major topics addressed during the meeting.

2.1 The reports on projects and activities developed by participants. (1)

- Higher Education projects focused on Educational Technology actually being developed in Peru (Adriana Saco).

Two major issues were addressed in the presentation: the curriculum design and development of the "Escuelas Superiores de Educación Profesional" (ESEPS) and the design and implementation of the curriculum of the Educational

(1) Topics follow chronological order of presentation.

Program at the Catholic University of Peru according to the principles of Educational Technology.

- National Educational Planning in Guatemala (Carlos Morales).

  Description of the current structure and situation of the formal educational system in Guatemala and presentation of the non-formal system as a means of tackling basic educational problems in the country, especially through the use of mass media (radio). Ways of providing a bridge between the formal and non-formal systems were also addressed.

- Importance of diffusion of information: the Educational Technology Magazine (Clifton Chadwick).

  Communication about publications in the area of Educational Technology sponsored by OAS: the Educational Technology Magazine, COMUNI-TED (a publication for people in contact with the Multinational Educational Technology Project) and NOTI-TED (a newsletter).

- Current CET activities and priorities (Robert Morgan).

  Description of major projects in which CET is involved encompassing activities in the following countries: Korea, Ethiopia, Colombia, Iran, Jordan. Focus is given to the research aspect in areas such as radio instruction, use of low-cost technology in non-formal education, effects of adoption of Educational Technology in developing countries.

- The Multinational Educational Technology Project of OAS (John Clayton).

  Communication as to the structure of the two-phase program (theoretical/practical) developed in the various Latin American Centers and the requirements for selection of trainees.

- New AID initiatives in Educational Technology (David Sprague/ Peter Boynton).

  Considerations about the AID efforts in Educational Technology as essentially a research and development program and specification of the major areas of interest in the field: extension of formal systems to rural areas, development of open non-formal systems, training and educational aspects related to agriculture, health and nutrition.

- Educational Technology Curriculum at the "Instituto Pedagógico" in Venezuela (Victor Zambrano).

  Presentation of the main accomplishments of the Instituto as well as problems related to the application of Educational Technology in that specific setting.

- Multinational course on Educational Technology in Caracas (David Vivas).

  Description of the program developed by the Center of Caracas as an integrated part of the Multinational Program in Educational Technology sponsored by OAS.

- The use of Educational Technology in Health Delivery Systems and its transfer to education (René Corradine).

  Report on a project conducted by the "Universidad del Valle" in Cali, Colombia, in which principles of instructional design and development were underlying the training given at different levels of personnel qualification. The possibility of transferring the approach to the educational setting was discussed.

- Masters program in Educational Technology at the National Institute of Spacial Research - INPE (Margarida Southard).

  Description of the structure and operational conditions of the Masters program at INPE and report on the development of a specific evaluation project in the area of telecommunication in the Brazilian State of Rio Grande do Norte.

- National Meeting on Educational Technology (Armando Dufey).

  Presentation of activities conducted in the National Meeting on Educational Technology in Costa Rica.

- Activities of the Center of Tele-education of the Catholic University of Peru (Estela Garland).

  Report on research, training, and materials development activities conducted at CETUC, in Peru.

- Educational Technology Project in Colombia (Arturo Garzon, Clementina Rodríguez, Elsy Leguizamón).

  Discussion of the qualitative and quantitative problems in education in Colombia and presentation of suggestions to approach both aspects.

- Program Instruction use in Panama (Rebeca Addison).

  Implementation aspects of a project on the use of Programmed Instruction in Commercial Education in Panama: types of students involved and teachers training required.

- Activities of the Center for Educational Technology in Recife/ Brazil (Hipólito González).

  Report on the project developed by the Center of Recife and description of a joint on-going project with the Federal University of Pernambuco for the development of instructional programs in areas related to Medical Science.

- An approach to teachers training (Pedro Turina).

  Presentation of the concentration areas of the Center for Teachers Training in which the participant has developed his efforts in making effective use of Educational Technology in the inservice training of teachers in Chile.

- Activities developed at the State Department of São Paulo and at the Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (Menga Lüdke).

  Communication about activities developed by participant in Brazil: an evaluation project whose methodology has been used as model for other evaluation studies; involvement in teaching activities at the Masters level, and orientation of research projects sponsored by the National Institute of Educational Research (INEP).

- The Center for Promotion of Rural Community Development in Mexico (Gabriela Briseño).

  Description of the Center's structure and operational activities.

- Some educational activities in Brazil (João Oliveira)

  Communication about the Brazilian Magazine on Telecommunication, description of an Educational TV Project being developed in the Brazilian State of Maranhão, and report on different activities already developed or to be initiated by the participant.

- Panama/Venezuela Project (Clifton Chadwick).

  Report on the project whose objective is to offer to the countries involved the possibility of developing a capacity of rational utilization of Educational Technology through the training of human resources for work at both the macro and micro levels.

2.2 The presentation by special guest

At the closing of the meeting activities, a presentation was made by Dr. Mauricio San Martin from the National Institute for Educational Research and Development (INIDE) from the Peruvian Ministry of Education.

The presentation concentrated in two major topics:

- the educational reform in Peru which was conceived as a means of democratization of learning in a manner to respond to the Peruvian needs;

- the activities developed by INIDE which are focused on four areas: training, research, documentation, and publications and educational materials.

Also in the first theme, emphasis was given to the description of the concept of community nuclei for educational purposes, the government target for 1975 being the total organization of the educational system into nuclei. With regard to the second topic, specific mention should be made of the teacher training program INIDE has been conducting through correspondence courses for which FSU was directly involved in the training of experts in materials design and development.

2.3 The topics addressed through small group meetings and seminar discussions.

Topics listed in the early proposed program mailed to participants were the themes for the work conducted in small groups and subsequent seminar discussions. Each small group composed of approximately six people presented its conclusions in plenary sessions from which a summary of major points by topic is here presented in terms of recommendations.

2.3.1 Focus on dissemination of the Educational Technology concept

- A need exists for two levels of information in the dissemination of the Educational Technology concept, the specificity of each being connected with the user's role in its implementation: a more general level for people in decision-making positions and a more detailed level of information for those directly involved in the field work.

- Positive dissemination of Educational Technology relies on actual results presented in the field application. To achieve a successful level of implementation the training of personnel directly involved in developing tasks specified in the implementation strategy becomes a crucial point and one that should deserve special consideration.

- Considering that Educational Technology has been raising high expectations in approaching quantitative as well as qualitative problems in the educational system of developing countries, it is of great importance to establish a very realistic connection between its planning and implementation. A failure to do so would probably result in a considerable delay in the diffusion of Educational Technology.

- With regard to the cost-effectiveness of Educational Technology, there is a need for careful planning especially related to long term commitments. Furthermore, attention should be given to avoid duplication of action in the field by integration of efforts in a unified plan which should, to the extent possible, make use of existent resources.

2.3.2 Focus on Educational Technology networks

- An analysis of the current networks in Educational Technology in Latin America has shown a restricted coverage of the needs. Besides a better diffusion on the part of the existing networks, a suggestion was made as to the possible creation of a professional organization comprising technologists working in the field.

2.3.3 Focus on training at FSU/CET

- Due to the many factors that interfere in the adaptation

of newcoming students to an educational system in a country not of their own, it would be advisable to establish a period for orientation prior to their official enrollment in the academic activities which would make cultural transition less hard and facilitate student adaptation to the system.

- Early stage orientation should emphasize the concept of Educational Technology and clarify misconceptions students might have. Objectives of training and possible tracks in the program should be made explicit from the beginning.

- Practical work is felt to be essential in the training a student receives and, therefore, opportunity of involvement of foreign students in on-going projects should be an integral part of their programs from the early stages.

- The presentation of Educational Technology as a value free approach was questioned by the group and the inclusion of a seminar focusing on the total spectrum of positions in the field was suggested.

- To better respond to the needs of foreign students, CET should reexamine the ways through which to match academic aspects of its training program with those needs. Instead of emphasis on a particular area of specialization, programs should be oriented to problem solving approach and decision-making process.

- Dissertation work related to problems identified by student in their country of origin should be encouraged on the part of CET.

- Professional isolation after the conclusion of training is one of the negative factors foreign students experience. A strong recommendation was made toward the establishment of some kind of communication channel with former students through which the latest findings in the area of Educational Technology would be disseminated.

2.3.4 Focus on international infrastructural agencies

- Specialists in the field most of the times do not know the resources that could be available through different international agencies for lack of diffusion of policies adopted by them. A request was made to AID and OAS representatives toward a more extensive dissemination of

their programs in Educational Technology especially by means of publications.

- General policy of international funding agencies should give priority to projects dealing with specific problems rather than broad initiatives whose effectiveness can hardly be appraised.

- A mechanism to assist the development of research in Latin America would be of great help especially if consideration is given to the problems related to transferability related to any innovative techniques.

SECTION III: THE EVALUATION

3.1 THE EVALUATION DESIGN

The evaluation of the meeting was designed to serve two main functions:

- to provide information as to the development of the meeting from a formative point of view so that the conference could be reshaped to better respond to participants interests;

- to provide summative information as to the effect and usefulness of the conference in terms of the pursued objectives.

Procedures used in the evaluation of the meeting basically fall into three categories: observation, interviews, and use of written instruments which included a biographical form, and formally developed instruments that were as follows:

- Evaluation form 01: Unstructured formative evaluation sheet.
- Evaluation form 02: Structured formative evaluation instrument.
- Evaluation form 03: Questionnaire on FSU training program in Educational Technology.
- Evaluation form 04: Questionnaire on the applicability of Educational Technology.
- Evaluation form 05: Overall meeting evaluation questionnaire.

A schedule of administration of the various instruments together with a copy of each of them is presented in Appendix II (page 28). Data

collected through the two first instruments were examined by a formative evaluation group consisting of the evaluator and four other participants. This group functioned in reshaping the program of activities according to the obtained information in the first days of the meeting.

The indicators connected with each objective set for the meeting as well as the techniques used to verify them are pointed out in the table that follows. Generally, analysis of the data was done in terms of consensus, the standard being at least 60% agreement among group responses.

TABLE 1: Meeting objectives, indicators of accomplishment, and techniques for verification

Objectives	Indicators	Techniques
1. To provide participants with an opportunity to share information as to the applicability of Educational Technology to Latin American educational problems.	-Responses to specific items in Evaluation Form 05 -Responses to interview questions -Reactions during meeting activities	-Administration of questionnaire -Interview -Observation
2. To collect information that may function as feedback to FSU as to the adequacy of its training in Educational Technology	-Responses to Evaluation Form 03 -Reactions and reports on the topic	-Administration of questionnaire -Observation
3. To gather information to determine what activities have been initiated by the trainees and to isolate problems and successes connected with them	-Responses to Evaluation Form 04 -Reports and discussions about initiated activities	-Administration of questionnaire -Observation and recording of information
4. To gather research and/or descriptive papers, and other written products from the participants	-Number of research papers, projects reports, books, work documents	-Examination and classification of documents presented
5. To explore the possibility of creating a technical pool among Latin American education specialists	-Reactions to the issue	-Observation
6. To explore the possibility of cooperative research, training and development activities among Latin American countries and FSU	-Reactions to the issue	-Observation

This document was processed for the ERIC Document Reproduction Service by the ERIC Clearinghouse at Stanford. We are aware that some pages probably will not be readable in microfiche or in Hardcopy form. However, this is the best available copy, and we feel that the document should not be withheld from interested readers on the basis of these unreadable pages alone.

3.2 THE RESULTS

Results of the evaluation will be presented under subheadings related to the pursued objectives.

Feedback as to FSU training program in Educational Technology

The reaction of former FSU students to the areas of competence available at the training program in Educational Technology in terms of perceived relevance to their actual work and the degree of satisfaction with their training in those areas is summarized in TABLE II. As the tallying of responses did not show great discrepancy among categories of respondents, according to degree earned or year of completion of training, percentage data presented refer to the total group.

TABLE II: Participant ratings of the relevance of areas of competence in FSU training program on Educational Technology and degree of their satisfaction with the training (percentage data).

AREAS OF COMPETENCE	Relevance				Satisfaction				
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3	NT*
1. Goal definition	00	00	10	90	00	30	30	25	15
2. Learning task analysis	00	15	15	70	00	15	15	50	20
3. Definition of objectives	00	05	20	75	00	05	30	50	15
4. Instructional Materials development	00	30	20	50	00	15	35	25	25
5. Selection and utilization of Media	05	05	25	65	05	15	40	15	25
6. Instructional delivery systems	00	15	25	60	00	35	30	05	30
7. Student assessment	05	25	15	55	05	10	35	25	25
8. Formative Evaluation: program revision	00	05	20	75	00	10	40	25	25
9. Summative evaluation	00	10	20	70	00	35	45	30	20
10. Needs analysis	00	10	25	65	05	20	25	20	30
11. Job analysis	00	35	50	15	05	20	35	10	30
12. Appraising resources and constraints	05	00	20	75	00	45	20	10	25
13. Designing teacher education	10	10	25	55	00	40	30	05	25
14. Project and program management	00	05	25	70	00	35	20	15	30
15. Research design	00	10	30	60	00	05	45	25	25
16. Data analysis	05	25	20	50	05	15	35	15	30
17. Adapting, marketing and utilization strategies	10	25	30	35	10	25	20	00	45
18. Educational Planning	00	10	35	55	00	10	30	25	35
19. Learning theories	00	10	35	55	00	10	35	35	20
20. Systems analysis	00	05	25	70	05	15	35	25	20
21. Socio-cultural factors in educational Development	00	10	20	70	00	35	20	20	25

* NT - Respondents who did not have training in the area of competence.

With regard to the relevance the listed areas of competence have in relation to the work currently being performed by the former FSU trainees, Goal definition was the one that received higher rating followed by Definition of objectives, Formative evaluation, Appraising resources and constraints, Project and Program Management, Systems analysis, Summative evaluation and Socio cultural factors in Educational Development. Rated as least relevant among the areas of competence were: Job analysis and Adapting, marketing, and utilization strategies, the other areas of competence following in between the two sets of more extreme positions.

Data on the scale on satisfaction seems to indicate less agreement among participants. Definition of objectives, Learning task analysis, Summative evaluation, Learning Theories, and Research Design were the areas of competence to show higher ratings with respect to students' satisfaction with training received. Lower ratings were attributed to Adapting, marketing, and utilization Strategies (which was one of the areas to receive higher ratings as to relevance), Instructional delivery systems, Appraising resources and constraints, Designing teacher education. As to lack of training was reported higher an area among the ones of highest rating in relevance: Adapting, marketing, and utilization strategies.

Besides rating the listed areas of competence, a few participants added some suggestions of other areas to be included as optional components of the training program: Communication techniques and Cost analysis.

Supervised research activities developed by participants concentrated mainly on area 4: Instructional materials development. For most of the students (95%) supervised research played an important role in their overall training and orientation received was satisfactory for 75% of the group. The importance given by the former students to supervised research is further evidenced through the number of hours for it recommended by 60% of the group: not less than ten hours.

As to field experience, defined as internship or any other "hands on" work, only 50% of the group reported having had it during their training at FSU. Field experience for 60% of the group was connected with CET and in 50% of the cases involved financial support from the Center. For 90% of the students having developed some "hands on" work, the experience was rated as essential to their overall training, major payoffs being the improvement of specific skills in their specialty area (60%) and opportunity for closer contact with faculty (40%).

Besides the previously mentioned activities, were reported by the meeting participants, as having greatly contributed to their program, activities such as:

- visits to special projects and programs related to the students program in other universities or different organizations;

- professional trips to other countries;

- participation in international and national seminars, meetings, or workshops.

Applicability of Educational Technology in Latin American countries

The rationale behind the inclusion of this topic among the objectives of the meeting was two-fold. One was to get an extended indicator of the effectiveness of FSU's training program in Educational Technology through the activities initiated by its former recipients. A second purpose was to identify major problems perceived by participants in the application of Educational Technology and its relationship, if any, to the type of training offered. An attempt was also made to identify approaches successfully tried by participants in dealing with those problems so that their knowledge can be shared by newcoming Latin American students.

In the description of the meeting activities, more specifically under item 2.1, some of the activities developed by participants have been briefly described. TABLE III represents an attempt to categorize the diversity of activities reported by students in the Evaluation Form 04.

TABLE III: Activities initiated by former students grouped by types

Major types	Specification	Reported No.
Research activities	-Research on Evaluation Methodologies	4
	-Effectiveness of Programmed Instruction	1
	-Teachers' attitudes toward Educational Technology	1
	-Socio-economic factors in rural communities	1
	-Socio psychology field research	1
Training of personell	-University faculty training	5
	-High school teachers	3
	-Elementary teachers	3
	-Promoters of community development	1
	-Personnel for educational TV	1
Materials development	-Development of PI texts	5
	-Development of modules or learning packages	3
	-Development of instructional programs for mass media	1
	-Books in the area of Instructional Systems	1
	-Development of mini-courses	1
Other activities	-Consulting activities	6
	-Project management activities	5
	-Evaluation Studies	3

In order to present students perceptions on the degree of seriousness of problems sometimes reported by people working in the field in relation to their particular settings in a more meaningful way, data were grouped by broad categories of problem in the table that follows:

TABLE IV: Problems related to the implementation of Educational Technology in terms of their degree of seriousness as perceived by participants (data in percentages).

Nature of the problem	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Conceptualization of Educational Technology	04	10	26	38	22
- Administrative infrastucture	02	06	20	36	36
- Social-political factors	03	06	25	35	31
- Human resources	02	07	21	41	29
- Materials and equipment	14	03	32	39	12

NP - not a problem

SP - a problem that has been solved

M - minor problem

S - a serious problem

VS - a very serious problem

The cluster of problems reported as most serious by the group was related to administrative infrastructure and within it the highly centralized administration systems as the greatest barrier for the work of the technologist. Other major specific problems within the remaining clusters were:

- as to social political factors: adoption of innovations without analysis of actual needs;

- as to human resources: lack of evaluation personnel;

- as to conceptualization of Educational Technology: lack of bibliography in the native language of the country to be used for dissemination purposes;

- as to materials and equipment: indiscriminate diffusion of poorly developed materials.

Among the approaches cited as being successful in dealing with the introduction of Educational Technology in the settings the participants have worked were:

- initiate action by diffusion of the meaning of Educational Technology;

- gather the best specialists in the area in order to work through teams;

- utilize the Educational Technology jargon the least as possible with users;

- avoid the idea of bringing ready-made solutions and work more with the transferability of processes rather than products;

- be prepared to possible frustrations and be alerted to opportunities;

- get in touch with government officials who are in positions to make decisions as to the use of Educational Technology in the system;

- give emphasis to the training of personnel for the implementation level.

Publications presented by participants

One of the objectives of the meeting referred to the gathering of

written products developed by participants which were made available for examination by the total group during the week of the meeting. Most of the publications displayed were documents developed through group work and varied from Strategy Plans to Modules of instruction and Programmed Instruction texts. In addition, four books and two research papers were written by the participants.

Based on the need for diffusion of principles and techniques of Educational Technology, participants were urged by some members of the group to contribute with articles to existing periodicals in the field, namely the publication of OAS (Educational Technology Magazine and the newsletters NOTI-TED and COMUNI-TED) and the Brazilian Tele-education Magazine, published at ABT (Brazilian Association of Telecommunication). Furthermore, participants who did not receive the mentioned publications were included in their mailing lists.

The meeting evaluation

Summative evaluation data as to the meeting activities are summarized in Table V. Because of small number of people in the categories of observers and participant-observers and no clear evidence of difference in responses by category of respondents, data are presented for the total group. For a more meaningful interpretation, data obtained through the six-point scales were collapsed into three types of response: unfavorable (1-2), neutral (3-4), and favorable (5-6) with respect to participants overall reaction to the aspect of the meeting being evaluated.

TABLE V: Evaluation of meeting aspects as reported by participants in Evaluation Form 05 (percentage of responses)

Meeting aspects	1-2 unfavorable	3-4 neutral*	5-6 favorable
1. Information received prior to the meeting	17	00	83
2. The objectives of the meeting	05	17	78
3. The meeting site	09	22	69
4. The time period of the meeting	13	13	74
5. The schedule of activities	17	26	57
6. The organization of the meeting	09	13	78
7. The opportunity for participation	04	13	83
8. The contact with Latin American colleagues	00	04	96
9. The plenary sessions	00	17	83
10. The small group sessions	04	09	87
11. The overall meeting	00	17	83

* The results as presented are conservative since a response attached to number 4 is evidently more favorable than neutral.

According to data presented in Table V, more than 50% of the group rated the several meeting aspects in the high end of the scale. Strongest point of the meeting seems to have been the opportunity for interaction with Latin American colleagues which supports the statement of satisfactory attainment of the conference in relation to one of the major pursued objectives, that is, to provide participants with an opportunity for developing professional contacts and share experiences with colleagues in Latin America. Further examination of the data shows a weakest point to be the schedule of activities. Comments indicated that some felt the schedule was very demanding, and more time was needed for group work activities.

The early formative evaluation of the meeting presented information that could be structured in positive and negative aspects. Among the negative eleven aspects suggested by participants and presented as problems in a latter structured formative instrument (Evaluation form 02-Appendix 2) after changes had been introduced into the program, 3 were not considered a problem by 80% or more of the audience and from the remaining 8, only one had not been eliminated and, more specifically, the non-observation of the schedule.

Among the major benefits reported by participants as being accomplished through the meeting were:

-knowledge of what is being done in Latin America in the area of Educational Technology (90%);

-knowledge of types of assistance offered by international agencies mainly AID and OAS (85%);

-sharing of ideas that will contribute to improvement of performance (95%);

-renewal of enthusiasm to continue in the chosen mission (80%);

-possibility of further interaction with Latin American colleagues due to new and renewed contacts (95%);

-challenge to Latin American technologists to better organize communication networks (85%).

3.3 THE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A comparison between the actual attainments of the conference with the project goals indicates that the meeting was quite successful. A closer examination of the objectives can further evidence this statement.

Objective I: to provide participants an opportunity to share information as to the applicability of Educational Technology in Latin America.

In the opinion of the participants as manifested in most questionnaires the opportunity for interaction provided by the meeting was deemed an outstanding accomplishment and many participants suggested that a similar type of event be repeated in the future. If this is to happen consideration should be given to the following major points:

- consultation with participants about the topics to be presented prior to the meeting and examination of outlines of presentations so that a better defined schedule of activities can be set in advance;

- allocation of more time to group work with limited number of presentations or possible spread of them into content areas in a manner that would allow participants to select to attend those more closely related to their interests;

- topics for discussion in groups could be shaped as problems in specific areas or proposition of case studies that would offer more straightforward guidelines for the work.

Objective II: to collect information that may function as feedback to FSU as to the adequacy of its training program in Educational Technology.

Many of the participants invited to the meeting were among the first groups of Latin American students received by CET and their feedback as to the training experienced at FSU highlighted important points, some of which had already been taken care for by the Center. In addition to the recommendations presented by groups during the plenary session dedicated to the topic and listed on pages 8 - 9 the following are suggestions reported in individual questionnaires

- Diffusion of information of the types of program available in the area of Educational Technology to agencies that are responsible for pointing out or selecting candidates for training;

- provision of parallel training in English for those students who do not have the minimum language requirements to follow the program;

- improvement of the advising procedures with some possible kind of coordination by CET in order to keep track of programs followed by trainees in relation to their individual needs and potential responsibilities especially in the practicum part of the program;

- provision of opportunity for work interaction of trainees with other foreign students and with Americans as well;

- inclusion of some kind of training in areas such as Anthropology, International Relations, Organizational Development, Transcultural Studies in the overall program through seminars oriented to the practical aspects of these themes.

Due to the emphasis given by participants to the issue, the recommendation previously made as to field experience will be repeated here. It was felt by the totality of participants that each trainee should be offered an opportunity for involvement in on-going projects related to his program of studies.

Objective III: to gather information to determine which activities have been initiated by the trainees and to isolate problems, successes, and failures of such activities.

Activities developed by participants that were reported during the meeting constituted a good indicator as to the importance the training received by former alumni had in their professional carriers. Further examination of those activities in terms of the difficulties former alumni had to deal with suggests an action that could be taken by CET and which was strongly recommended by participants: the establishment of a mechanism of information that would function in both directions, to and from former students, and would be a vehicle of actualization of former trainees as to the latest developments, in the field of Educational Technology.

Objective IV: to gather research and/for descriptive papers, and other written products from the meeting participants that could be disseminated to a wider audience.

Written products presented by participants were made available for examination to the whole group during the meeting and materials donated to FSU will be placed in CET's library for consultation by graduate students. Copies of publications were directly solicited

by the ones interested to the person responsible for the publication. The meeting also played an important role in offering opportunity for diffusion of already existing publications in the area of Educational Technology as mentioned in page 4.

Objective V: to explore the possibility of creating a technical pool among Latin American education specialists.

Objective VI: to explore the possibility of cooperative research, training and development activities among Latin American countries and FSU.

Suggestions related to both topics were spontaneously brought about by participants. The need for the creation of a professional organization to congregate educational technologists in Latin America was manifested but, because it was not FSU's intention to impose or patronize such an initiative, no effort was made to encourage the participants to make a motion to set up such an organization. It was felt by the conference leadership that the idea will probably be further considered and it is the intention of FSU/CET to send participants correspondence reminding them of the mentioned possibility of creation of some organizational structure which hopefully they themselves will take the initiative of starting.

In conclusion, it is important to note the uniqueness of the meeting: it was to our knowledge the first time a group of Latin American educators from different countries, all of whom had studied at a single university in a major educational program, were able to get gotether on a professional basis. Though one of the tests for the success of the conference will emerge later (objectives V and VI), the meeting can be said to have adequately reached its objectives.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

(Name, country of origin, organization in which participant works, address of organization, and area of specialization)

Rebeca de Addison
Panama
Ministerio de Educación-
Educación Profesional y
Técnica - Panamá
Instructional Design

Peter Boynton
USA
USAID, Social Development
Unit, c/o American Embassy
Bogotá, Colombia
Non-formal Education

Gabriela Briseño
Mexico
In-service Training Center
for Community Development
Luis González Obregón 14
2do Piso
México 1, D.F.
Instructional Design

Clifton Chadwick
USA
Organization of American
States
Tonogasta 5268, Buenos
Aires, Argentina
Learning Psychology,
Evaluation design

John Clayton
USA
Educational Technology
Unit, OAS
Washington, D. C. 20006
Catalytic conversion

René Corradine
Colombia
FES
Calle 11 #1-07
Cali, Colombia
Educational Systems Planning
and Administration

Ovideo de Leon
Panamá
Departamento de Asuntos
Educativos, OAS
1735 Eye Street, N.W., Room 925
Washington, D.C.

Armando Dufey
Chile
University of Chile
Rancagua 544
Santiago, Chile
Chemistry, Curricular Develop-
ment for Higher Education

J. L. Gant
USA
College of Education, Room 209
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Estela de Garland
Peru
Centro de Teleducación de la
Universidad Católica
CETUC
Apartado 1761
Lima, Perú
Tele-education

Arturo Garzón
Mexico
Organization of American States
1735 Eye Street, N.W., Room 925
Washington, D.C. 20006
Research and Evaluation

José Hipólito González
Colombia
Educational Technology Unit, OAS
1735 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
Systems Analysis

Sydney R. Grant
USA
College of Education
Room 209
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

Elsy Leguizamón
Colombia
Ministerio de Educación Nacional
CAN, División Radio y TV
Educativas
Bogotá, Colombia
Psico-Pedagogía
Instructional Design

Menga Lüdke
Brazil
Universidad Catolica de Rio
de Janeiro
R. Marquês de São Vicente 209
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Sociology of Education-
Research Methods

Carlos Morales
Guatemala
General Secretary of Economic
Planning (Human Resources
Division) Anexo del Banco de
Guatemala, 3er Piso
Guatemala, Guatemala, C.A.

Robert M. Morgan
USA
Center for Educational Technology
Florida State University
415 North Monroe Street, Room 618
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Vitória Dalva Nascimento
Brazil
Graduate Student
Center for Educational Technology
Florida State University
415 North Monroe Street, Room 602
Tallahassee, Florida 32301
Educational Evaluation

Miryam Ochoa
Colombia
Caribbean Information Center on
Instructional Technology/UNICA
Edificio Proas
Calle 17 # 4, Oficina 501
Bogotá, Colombia
Message design

Joao Oliveira
Brazil
P.N.T.E.-FINEP
Av. Rio Branco 124-12°
Andar, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Instructional Systems
(macro & micro)

Raúl Palacios
Peru
Dirección de Educación Superior
Universidad Católica
CETUC
Apartado 1761
Lima, Perú
Instructional Design

Clementina Rodríguez
Colombia
Ministerio de Educación C.A.N.
Bogotá, Colombia
Instructional Design

Adriana de Saco
Peru
Dirección General de Educación
del Ministerio de Educación
Lima, Perú
Social Sciences & Instructional
Systems

Margarida Southard
Brazil
Institute of Space Research INPE
INPE
Caixa Postal 515
São José dos Campos
São Paulo, Brazil
Research and Evaluation

David Sprague
USA
AID
TA/EHR Room 2485
New State Building
Department of State
Washington, D.C.
Instructional Design &
Program Development

Pedro Turina
Chile
Centro de Perfeccionamiento
Ministerio de Educación
Lo Barnechea
Santiago 10, Chile
Chemistry

David Vivas
Venezuela
Instituto Pedagógico
Avenida Paez
El Paraíso
Caracas, Venezuela
Educational Research

Marie Vivas
Venezuela
Instituto Pedagógico de
Caracas - Dpto. Pedagogía
Apartado 60606
Caracas, Venezuela

Pablo Willstatter
Peru
Peruvian Institute for the
Promotion of Education
IPFE
Apartado 5254
Lima, Perú
Higher Education Administration

Victor Zambrano
Venezuela
Instituto Pedagógico
Apartado 200076
San Martin, Caracas 102, Venezuela
Instructional Systems

APPENDIX II

EVALUATION SCHEDULE AND INSTRUMENTS

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION SCHEDULE

Your participation in the evaluation of the meeting will require approximately 30 minutes of your time at the end of activities of each day. In addition, there may be brief personal interviews during the week.

The schedule presented below has the objective of prompting you for the type of instrument to which you will be asked to respond. The schedule is tentative and may be modified.

Days	Type of instrument	Respondents
I	-Biographical form	Participants
	-Unstructured formative evaluation sheet	Participants Participant/observers Observers
II	-Questionnaire on FSU training program	FSU former students
	-Unstructured formative evaluation sheet	(Optional)
III	-Structured formative evaluation instrument	Participants Participant/observers Observers
IV	-Questionnaire on applicability of Educational Technology in Latin American educational settings by participants.	FSU former students
V	-Instrument on meeting appraisal in terms of accomplishments, problems, and benefits.	Participants Participant/observers Observers

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

PARTICIPANT BIOGRAPHICAL FORM

01. Name

02. Country of origin | 03. Languages spoken

04. Area of specialization

05. Home address

06. Bachelor's degree in: | 07. University | 08. Year of completion

09. Master's degree in: | 10. University | 11. Year of completion

12. Doctoral degree in: | 13. University | 14. Year of completion

15. Relevant specialization training or course * | 16. Organization | 17. Duration

* If you need more space to answer item 15, please check here__ and write on attached page.

18. Main present position:

19. Mailing Address of organization:

20. Previous positions (Please mention the country if not your country of origin)

21. Publications (Please specify if book, research paper, article in journal, etc. and dates)

USE ATTACHED PAGE FOR OBSERVATIONS OR COMPLEMENTARY INFORMATION.

Signature _____

Date _____

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION FORM 01

Date

The purpose of this form is to collect information as to the development of the meeting activities so that the meeting itself can be responsive to the group interests. Please state the positive and negative aspects you have observed and add suggestions that you would like to see introduced.

Do not sign, but please check your participation role:

☐ participant ☐ participant-observer ☐ observer

1. POSITIVE ASPECTS

2. NEGATIVE ASPECTS

3. SUGGESTIONS

USE ADDITIONAL PAGE IF NECESSARY.

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION FORM 02

This evaluation instrument is based on your reaction to the formative evaluation sheets during the two first days of the meeting. Its purpose is to verify if the modifications introduced in the program have responded to your interest.

PART I

The statements listed below correspond to negative aspects pointed out by participants. Use the following letter code to assess your position as to each of them by circling the corresponding letter.

EP - A problem that has been eliminated
SP - Still a problem to be solved
NP - I do not consider it a problem

-Very long presentations	EP	SP	NP
-Tendency to depart from the subject	EP	SP	NP
-Excess of time spent on policies and strategies	EP	SP	NP
-Lack of equipment for multiple translations	EP	SP	NP
-Bad space arrangement in conference room	EP	SP	NP
-Heavy schedule of activities	EP	SP	NP
-Unbalanced distribution of participants among groups	EP	SP	NP
-Lack of observation of schedule	EP	SP	NP
-Late beginning of activities	EP	SP	NP

-Very big group for plenary discussions	EP	SP	NP
-Lack of use of audio-visual materials during presentations	EP	SP	NP

PART II

Below there is a list of the positive aspects of the meeting as reported in the formative evaluation instruments during the two first days.

You are asked in this part:

a) To determine whether or not you consider each aspect a positive point in the meeting by circling yes or no;

b) To assess each statement considered as a positive aspect in relation to its contribution to the meeting.

A - Essential to the meeting success
B - Important but not essential to the meeting success
C - Not important in terms of contribution to the meeting

	POSITIVE ASPECT?		ESSENTIALITY		
-Clear introduction of participants	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Informality of activities	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Active participation	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Themes of interest to all participants	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Opportunity for exchange of experiences	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Good criteria for selection of participants	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Good selection of locale	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Flexible schedule	YES	NO	A	B	C

	POSITIVE ASPECT?		ESSENTIALITY		
-Good interpersonal relations among participants	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Concern with each participant	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Opportunity of knowing other people working in the area of Educational Technology	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Opportunity to meet people with whom you have studied and/or worked before	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Relaxed atmosphere	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Organization of the small groups	YES	NO	A	B	C
-Overall organizational aspects	YES	NO	A	B	C

PART III

Do you have any other observations to make?

As to positive aspects

As to negative aspects

As to suggestions

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION FORM 03

One of the purposes of the FSU Latin American Alumni Meeting is to assess the adequacy of the FSU training program in Educational Technology in fulfilling the needs and demands of the range of job expectations in the field.

This questionnaire is intended to collect information that can be used as feedback to FSU in reappraising its program in the area of Educational Technology. Please be frank and feel free to add any other item that might have been overlooked in any section of this instrument. Use the extra pages provided at the end of the questionnaire if you feel like extending your answer to the open-ended questions or qualifying any response. It is not necessary to identify yourself.

PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What type of degree did you receive at FSU? Use a check mark to identify it and also specify the year in which it was completed as well as your area of specialization.

☐ Masters — Year of completion _____

☐ Doctoral — Area of specialization

☐ Training Certificate — _____

☐ No Degree

2. What was the time span in which you were enrolled at FSU?

☐ Less than 6 months

☐ From 6 to 12 months

☐ From 13 to 24 months

☐ More than 24 months

3. In which field(s) are you working presently and what was the initial date (month and year) in which you occupied the position(s)? Instead of a check mark, use the following code to identify the type of organization you are working in:

A (private) B (public)

	Initial date
☐ R & D Planning Organization	_____
☐ R & D Implementing Agency	_____
☐ R & D Funding Agency	_____
☐ Learning Institution	_____
☐ Other (specify) _____	_____

SECTION I

In this section you are asked to assess the basic and cognate areas of competence that are included in the current program of studies in Instructional Systems at FSU. Your assessment should be done in terms of the relevance (scale A) of those areas to the work you are now performing and the degree of satisfaction (scale B) with the training you had in them. Please use a check mark to indicate your position in the two scales provided for each area of competence, leaving blanks in scale B for the areas not included in your program.

Scale A

0. not relevant
1. little relevant
2. relevant
3. hightly relevant

Scale B

0. not satisfactory
1. little satisfactory
2. satisfactory
3. highly satisfactory

AREAS OF COMPETENCE	Relevance to your work SCALE A 0	1	2	3	Satisfaction with training SCALE B 0	1	2	3
1. Goal definition								
2. Learning task analysis								
3. Definition of objectives								
4. Instructional materials development								
5. Selection and utilization of media								
6. Instructional delivery systems								
7. Student assessment								
8. Formative evaluation: program revision								
9. Summative evaluation								
10. Needs analysis								
11. Job analysis								
12. Appraising resources and constraints								
13. Designing teacher education								
14. Project and program management								
15. Research design								
16. Data analysis								
17. Adapting, marketing, and utilization strategies.								
18. Educational planning								
19. Learning theories								
20. Systems analysis								
21. Social-cultural factors in Educational Development								

SECTION II

Other than regular course areas, different activities might have contributed to your training. The questions in this section are intended to address some of them.

SUPERVISED RESEARCH (and/or individualized studies).

1. Which areas listed in section I (page 2) was your supervised research concentrated on? Use numbers to identify them.

_____

2. How would you classify the contribution of supervised reseach to your overall training?

Most effective ☐

Effective ☐

Of little effectiveness ☐

Not effective ☐

3. How much orientation did you receive in your supervised research?

Extensive ☐

Enough ☐

Very little ☐

None at all ☐

4. How many hours of supervised research do you think a student should have in a total of 50 credits of work?

Less than five hours ☐

Five hours ☐

Five to ten hours ☐

More than ten hours ☐

5. From your personal experience, what procedures do you suggest in order to improve the conditions for supervised research?

FIELD EXPERIENCE

1. Did you have field experience such as internship or other "hands on" work during your training at FSU?

   Yes ☐

   No ☐

   If you answer to this question was negative, please skip this part and move to page 6 (OTHER ACTIVITIES).

2. Which unit was your field assignment connected with? Check more than one if applicable.

   Center for Educational Technology ☐

   Division of Instructional Research and Service ☐

   Educational Research and Evaluation Center (Evaluation Training Center) ☐

   R & D Project at the University ☐

   School System ☐

   State Agency ☐

   Other (specify) ☐

   _____

3. Did your field experience involve paid work?

   Yes ☐

   No ☐

4. What percentage did your field practical experience represent in your overall program?

   Less than 25% ☐

   From 25% to 50% ☐

   From 51% to 75 % ☐

   More than 75% ☐

5. How would you qualify the role of the field experience in your overall training?

   Essential to my program ☐

   Important but not essential ☐

   Relatively unimportant ☐

   Extra burden without any payoff ☐

6. In case you feel that your field experience played an important role in your program, which payoff(s) do you consider were more relevant?

   Opportunity for closer contact with faculty ☐

   Improvement of specific skills in your specialty ☐

   Opportunity of knowing other students ☐

   Improvement in your command of English ☐

   Understanding of the American Educational system ☐

   Other (specify) ☐

   _____

7. Do you have any suggestions to make as to students participation in field work at FSU?

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Did you participate in any other activities (such as seminars, travels, conferences, meetings, etc.) that were especially important to your training? If so, please specify the activities as well as the reason(s) why you consider them relevant. Also indicate if they were oriented toward other countries rather than the USA.

SECTION III

In this section you are asked to evaluate general statements about your program at FSU from a pre to a post-phase of training. Please indicate your degree of agreement (or disagreement) with the ones that are applicable to your particular case by using a check mark. Please add specific suggestions as to what the University may do to help its foreign students in each of these phases.

D- strongly disagree; d- disagree; a- agree; A- strongly agree

PRE-TRAINING PHASE

	D	d	a	A
1. My knowledge of the American Higher Educational System was fairly good prior to entering FSU.				
2. My knowledge as to which types of program I could have at the University was quite reliable.				
3. I had a fairly good orietation as to the functioning of FSU prior to starting my training.				
4. I felt that my educational background was not strong enough when I entered the University.				
5. My command of the English language was very poor before I started my training.				

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

TRAINING PHASE	D	d	a	A
1. There was an incompatibility between my personal objectives and the types of programs offered by FSU.				
2. Lack of command of the English language was a problem for me during the early stages of my training.				
3. The difference between the educational system in 'my' country and the American system constituted a problem for me in the beginning of my training.				
4. I could have profitted more from my training if I had known what type of position I would get when returning to 'my' country.				
5. Most of my courses (more than 70%) included principles and techniques that are not applicable to developing countries.				
6. Most of my courses were too theoretically oriented.				
7. I had an opportunity to work my schedule so that I had most of the courses I wanted to take.				
8. My involvement with CET provided me with better orientation than other foreign students I knew who did not have the same opportunity.				

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

POST-TRAINING PHASE

	D	d	a	A
1. It was difficult to adapt techniques learned in a developed country to a developing setting.				
2. People in the country where I work expected more from me than I actually had learned.				
3. The transfer of theoretical knowledge into practice was a very difficult task.				
4. I had an opportunity to apply most of what I learned (more than 70%) in my work.				
5. The use of different type of equipment represented a serious problem for me.				
6. Communication with colleagues was one of the problems I had when returning to work.				
7. As a result of my training I was offered better position in the educational system of 'my' country.				
8. Due to my training, I had a better understanding of the problems and possibilities of the educational system of 'my' country.				

SPECIFIC SUGGESTIONS

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION FORM 04

The purpose of this evaluation form is to collect information about the activities you have initiated in the field of Educational Technology after your training at FSU as well as to assess some of the problems you might have encountered in developing them.

Your signature is not required and information contained in the individual forms will be strictly confined to the evaluator's knowledge.

Please use additional pages if necessary to complement your responses.

PART I

Which activities have been initiated by you in the categories listed below? Please specify them and use the following letter code in order to assess their results in terms of accomplishment of pursued objectives.

A - Objectives achieved without major problems.
B - Objectives achieved but with difficulties.
C - Objectives only partially achieved.
D - Objectives not achieved.

1. R & D activities

2. Training of personnel

3. Materials development

4. Other types of activities

PART II

In this part you are asked to assess problems sometimes reported by people working in the field of Educational Technology in terms of the seriousness they present in the setting you have been working in.

Please circle the appropriate letter code for each problem.

NP - Has not been a problem.
SP - A problem that has been solved.
M - A minor problem.
S - A serious problem.
VS - A very serious problem.

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

- Lack of understanding of what is meant by "Educational Technology" (connection of the term with hardware only).	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Communication problems due to lack of diffusion of terms used in Educational Technology.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of bibliography in the native language of the country in which you have been working.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Misconception of evaluation which is seldomly viewed as a means of improvement but, very often, as "inspection."	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Imprecision in defining objectives at any level.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

ADMINISTRATIVE INFRA-STRUCTURE

- Obsolete infra-structure in which innovations can hardly be introduced.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of clear delimitation of responsibilities in different sectors of the educational system.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Highly centralized administration.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

- Lack of an integrated national plan in the field of Educational Technology.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of planning skills at the administrative level.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Resistance to a more systematic approach to planning.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of effective communication channels.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

SOCIAL-POLITICAL FACTORS

- Adoption of innovations without analysis of actual needs.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Decrease in interest in projects as they are implemented.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Isolation from information as to development of Educational Technology in other countries.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Frustration and discouragement of capable personnel as a consequence of social problems.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

HUMAN RESOURCES

- Lack of human resources capable of developing instructional materials.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of trained personnel at the administrative level.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Lack of evaluation personnel.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Inexistence of a network of specialists among whom ideas and problems can be discussed.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Fear of Educational Technology as a possible substitute for the use of human resources.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT

- Lack of developed and commercially available materials.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

- Lack of equipment to carry out stated plans.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Obsolete equipment that does not respond to the needs.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Underuse of equipment for lack of personnel trained to deal with it.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Inadequate use of materials by people in the field.	NP	SP	M	S	VS
- Allocation of financial resources to the diffusion of poorly developed materials.	NP	SP	M	S	VS

PART III

1. In dealing with some of the problems previously listed you might have identified successful approaches. Please state briefly some of the approaches that you consider might be generalizable to other settings having the same problems or constraints.

2. Which contributions do you think FSU might present to former students in dealing with technical problems its graduates might have in other countries?

FSU LATIN AMERICAN ALUMNI MEETING

EVALUATION FORM 05

On this form you are asked to assess the FSU Latin American Alumni Meeting in terms of its accomplishments, problems, and benefits. Your information will serve as one of the basic inputs for the evaluation of the overall meeting and will be considered in case FSU has an opportunity to conduct another meeting of this sort.

Please be frank and informative in your responses. Use the additional blank pages at the end of this instrument if you want to extend your answer to any of the open-ended questions or further qualify any response. You are not required to identify yourself but please check your participation role in the meeting.

☐ Participant ☐ Participant-observer ☐ Observer

PART I

This part calls for your evaluation of the meeting itself in terms of its planning and operational aspects. Please place a check mark on one of the six spaces provided in each scale connected with the items listed below. Additional comments will be most welcomed.

1. The information received prior to the meeting.

   a. Unsatisfactory /_____/ Highly satisfactory

   b. Not in time /_____/ With plenty of time

   c. Ambiguous /_____/ Very clear

   d. Comments _____

      _____

2. The objectives of the meeting.

   a. Not communicated /_____/ Clearly communicated

   b. Unsatistactory /_____/ Highly satisfactory

   c. Not achieved /_____/ Fully achieved

   d. Comments _____

      _____

3. The meeting site.

   a. Unsatisfactory /_____/ Highly satisfactory

   b. Not well equipped /_____/ Very well equipped

   c. Comments _____

      _____

4. The time period of the meeting.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Too long /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Too short

c. Comments _____

_____

5. The schedule of activities.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Inflexible /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Flexible

c. Not demanding /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly demanding

d. Comments _____

_____

6. The organization of the meeting.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Inflexible /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Flexible

c. Not planned /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Well planned

d. Comments _____

_____

7. The opportunity for participation in the meeting.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Badly distributed /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Well distributed

c. Comments _____

_____

8. The contact with Latin American colleagues.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Not profitable /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Very profitable

c. Unimportant /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly important

d. Comments _____

_____

9. The plenary sessions.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Not challenging /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly challenging

c. Too long /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Too short

d. Comments _____

_____

10. The small group sessions.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Not challenging /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly challenging

c. Too long /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Too short

d. Comments _____

_____

11. The overall meeting.

a. Unsatisfactory /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly satisfactory

b. Not challenging /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly challenging

c. Not profitable /__/__/__/__/__/__/__/ Highly profitable

d. Comments _____

_____

PART II

The purpose of this section is to collect your opinion as to which problems and benefits the meeting offered as well as information that may be useful as input for other activities of this sort.

1. What do you consider to be the main problems, if any, with the meeting?

1.1. As to the planning of the meeting

1.2. As to the development of the meeting

1.3. As to the facilities

1.4. Other problems

2. What were the benefits you got from the meeting?

2.1. As to 'knowledge'

2.2. As to promising cooperative projects

2.3. Other benefits

3. Do you have any suggestions to make in case it is possible to conduct another meeting of this sort in the future?

3.1. As to the locale

3.2 As to the time period

3.3. As to the activities

3.4. As to the topics to be discussed

3.5. Other suggestions